

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Drawings

Although the Applicant strongly disagrees that those skilled in the art would consider it new matter to include a schematically drawn field winding, rotor, or coaxial shafts in an electromagnetic coupler, machine M101 has been re-drawn to delete all details, no matter how inherent or schematic. Therefore, the new matter objection to the depiction of the field windings, shaft, and rotor has been overcome.

2. Clutch CL101

It is respectfully noted that clutch CL101 was in fact described in col. 3, lines 55-59 of the original patent as follows: "*An optional clutch CL101 controlled by the central controller CCU101 and installed between the rotational field generating structure and the rotor as required to directly provide a synchronized mechanical interlock between the field and rotor.*" While clutch CL101 was never actually claimed (it was mentioned in the original claims as a meaningless "optional" element, and therefore deleted in order to place the claim in proper format), it nevertheless was (and is) described in the specification and therefore may be shown in the drawings. Therefore, the inclusion of clutch CL101 somewhere in device M101 (so that it can be "between the rotational field generating structure and the rotor as required"), but depicted entirely in schematic form, should not be deemed "new matter."

Since the Applicant is not permitted to show a rotational field generating structure or rotor (no matter how schematic), it is respectfully submitted that depicting the clutch as a block within the coupling device block is the only way that clutch CL101 can be depicted (unless the Examiner wishes the field winding and rotor to be depicted as blocks with dotted lines connecting them to the clutch block, which would basically look ridiculous and would be considered totally un-necessary by the skilled artisan). Furthermore, it is noted that the

connection between CL101, the rotor, and the field winding is not claimed and therefore not required to be depicted in the drawings.

3. Deletion of U101; B101; Amendments to Claims 16 and 17

In the Official Action, the Examiner suggests that deletion of U101 from the drawings would be “new matter” because it is essential subject matter. In reply, the Applicant respectfully submits that:

1. U101 is not mentioned anywhere in the original specification;
2. U101 is not mentioned anywhere in the original independent claims;
3. Instead, it is only mentioned in dependent claims 16 and 17.

Since U101 is not described in the specification or recited in the independent claims, it could hardly be considered to be “essential.”

Furthermore, it is clear that the reference to “the electromagnetic coupling device (U101)” in claims 16 and 17 was the result of a typographic error since claim 16 depends from claim 2, and claim 2 recites “electromagnetic coupling device (M101)” rather than “electromagnetic coupling device (U101).” Claims 16 and 17 only make sense if the reference to “the electromagnetic coupling device” is to the same electromagnetic coupling device recited in claim 2, from which it depends.

Since the specification does not anywhere mention U101 and the claims do not anywhere recite U101 except by way of an obvious typographic error in dependent claims 16 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that it could not possibly be new matter to delete U101 from the drawings. To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicant is required to delete this element from the drawings in order to ensure consistency between the drawings and specification. Since the element was not described in the specification or claimed, the inclusion of U101 in the drawings could only have been the result of an error (which it in fact was), and therefore it is proper to correct the error in this reissue by deleting the undescribed element.

Serial Number 09/580,968

Since element 103 is also not described anywhere in the original specification or claims, it is respectfully submitted that element B103 also could hardly be considered essential, and therefore its removal from the drawings also does not involve new matter.

4. New Issues

The above-amendments address each of the "new issues" listed in the Advisory Action. Therefore, entry and consideration of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA

Registration No. 33,805

Date: December 22, 2003

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB\S\Producer\neu\Pending Q..ZVY\YANG\8096\Fu05.wpd